HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 28 Wednesday, July 15, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLL.
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

KOZLOV: *Special pipeline to the Kremlin*.....(page 1)

APPEASEMENT: *Pressure from two fronts*(page 1)

LABOR: *Behind the steel picture*.....(page 2)

EDUCATION: *Sex vs. science*.....(page 2)

FOREIGN AID: *US comforts Reds*.....(page 3)

Behind the Kozlov Visit: While the Soviet Deputy Premier visits at will any part of the United States, including our big industrial center of Detroit, the Reds have so far not approved the itinerary—including Ural and Siberian industrial centers—which Vice President Richard Nixon wants to cover on his trip later this month to the Soviet Union.

Nixon, according to the *Washington Daily News*, is "adamant" that there be no Soviet censorship of dispatches filed by the 60-odd US newsmen who will accompany him. But on that matter, no approval to date has come from Moscow. Those correspondents who have served in the Soviet capital predict the Kremlin okay will not be forthcoming. Meanwhile, absolutely no censorship covers Soviet so-called newspapermen who are reporting on the Kozlov visit.

The much-advertised "frankness" and "candor" attributed to Kozlov did not impress many newsmen in Washington, as witness his session with members of the National Press Club which (together with the Overseas Press Club) held a luncheon for the purpose of grilling the Soviet official. Such luncheons are a feature of the National Press Club, and many "hot" questions are directed at the "honored guests."

In the case of Kozlov, Soviet Ambassador Menshikov insisted on "screening" the questions. The Soviet Deputy Premier was thus spared the ordeal of facing "sizzling" questions which is the usual treatment of such guests.

A great deal of discussion has gone on in the Nation's Capital about the fact that Kozlov was in Washington and "faced the press" at the time when the "Harriman Story" broke. Averell Harriman, in Moscow, had a private interview with Khrushchev during which the Soviet dictator practiced terroristic tactics on the former Governor of New York, threatening the US with war if our leaders did not surrender to his demands for the West to give up Berlin. Much Capital discussion revolved around whether Kozlov, in his remarks on the touchy subject, had been briefed by cable or wireless from Moscow.

Few who fanned the air on this topic had heard the charge—relayed to HUMAN EVENTS *by communications experts—that the Soviet Government enjoys the use of a clandestine radio sending and receiving apparatus right in the heart of Washington. The set-up is within a Soviet-leased building—barred and security proof—in the midst of the diplomatic quarter. Kozlov could have been —and undoubtedly was—briefed hour by hour on what went on in Moscow and what the orders were from Khrushchev.*

Why this secret radio station is tolerated by the Federal authorities remains a mystery. It is not officially approved—so say our informants. During World War II, the Soviet military mission had a similar station in the Pentagon with the approval of our Government. After the war, the Soviet officers continued to use it, until it was called to the attention of General George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff, who ordered it dismantled and taken away.

● Russian news photographers with Kozlov had a field day in Chicago. Declining to get pictures of attractive residential sections, they instead photographed slums—for propaganda purposes—and took miles of film showing strategic industrial and transportation centers. State Department security officials did not interfere with the smiling Red camera men.

Appeasement Forces at Work: "A great job has been done on the American public, without the public in the least realizing it." So say public relations experts who read the papers and assess the headlines against their own background of knowledge of manipulation of opinion and of what is known about the policies of foreign governments—specifically Soviet Russia and Great Britain.

Job No. 1—Soviet Russia. While Kozlov strolls across our cities and industrial centers, patting little children on the head and otherwise putting on an act of being "human," the while talking of "friendship," his boss Khrushchev grants an interview to the former Governor of New York, Averell Harriman. The latter is still a power in the Democratic party and may have a say in the naming of its next Presidential candidate. At present, he is posing as a foreign correspondent. Khrushchev, in his interview with Harriman, used profane and obscene language and threatened the US with war if our leaders did not surrender to his demands for taking over Berlin. Harriman's "reporting" suggested that the US—in view of K's attitude—should go to a summit meeting, or the Soviet dictator might plunge the world into nuclear war. The "reporting" appeared in last week's *Life* magazine, with a circulation of six million. Of course, anything connected with Russia remains under suspicion—baby kissing, or not—with the bulk of the American people. Still, as the experts remark, "A fine piece of work."

Job No. 2—Here, say our technical friends, is a nice example of the "angle approach." A slick public rela-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions man always seeks some disarming approach, and what—it is asked—is more disarming than a celebration in honor of the St. Lawrence Seaway? What—it is further asked—could be more natural than that the Queen of England should visit Canada and then Chicago as the largest US city benefiting from the seaway? City fathers being what they are, a tremendous municipal festivity was staged, with all sorts of people vying for the privilege of lunching with a Queen.

All this, of course, was not designed in Moscow. But it was designed in London, where the British Government sends the beautiful Queen forth to all parts of the world on public relations missions; especially the cultivation of British Commonwealth countries—for imperial tariff preference is a "must" for the British business level. However, an observer need not be cynical to suggest that the Queen's visit was admirably timed to keep Anglo-American relations "sweet," just at a juncture when the British Government has shown little cooperation with the US State Department in preserving a strong front against Soviet aggressive designs on Berlin. Feeling is growing in the US that our real "friends" across the Atlantic are not in Britain, but in France, Germany and Italy—all of which have shown steadfast opposition to Soviet threats and blackmail, while British leaders plead for a summit meeting.

Thus, the American public is presented with two images—a smiling, affable Kozlov, behind whom lurks an ogre-like Khrushchev; and a charming British monarch of a people now resigned to appeasement of Russia and topped by a Government vowed to destroy the fundamental policy (for which Dulles fought and died) of a free world united against the blackmail of Moscow.

Fortunately, according to those who know him well, President Eisenhower stood firm against Kozlov, treated him "rough" and showed no intention of yielding to Muscovite threats.

Labor Front: Vice President Nixon—it is reliably reported—brought about the extension of steel union-management negotiations from July 1 to July 15. He reportedly persuaded President Eisenhower to write the letter to Steelworkers chief David McDonald, on June 27, expressing hope that the two sides would continue bargaining. The reason Nixon acted, it is claimed, sprang from a talk he had with Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, who urged him to make the move. Mitchell plays it very closely with the labor bosses, and the story goes that McDonald, who feared to call a strike of his members on July 1, wanted to be given a "face-saving" opportunity. The President's letter saved McDonald's face, and he ordered members to continue working while negotiations continued.

The reason McDonald feared a strike was that many of his top aides considered the prospect of a strike very unpopular with the rank and file. Meanwhile, the companies seemed firm and strong. The steelworkers' boss knew that if he won little, after calling for a strike which would prove expensive to the workers, he would face trouble in holding his position as president. There is a strong anti-McDonald faction in the union.

This story draws unfavorable comments among Republicans on Capitol Hill. They distrust Mitchell, whom they consider a crafty, selfish bureaucrat, prejudiced in favor of the labor bosses. Besides, they do not consider him a Republican. A developing Nixon-Mitchell axis in the Government bodes no good for the former's candidacy for the GOP Presidential nomination.

● The public blames labor most for inflation—according to a recent Trendex News Poll. "Which do you think is most responsible for continuing inflation—Government, private industry or labor unions?"—was the question asked by Trendex interviewers from coast to coast. The score came out as follows: (1) labor unions—40.8 per cent; (2) Government—25.1 per cent; and (3) private industry—11.2 per cent. Those blaming the unions usually said wage increases forced higher prices; many added that these higher prices again started demands for higher wages. "Vicious circle" was an expression frequently used. A much larger proportion of women than men blamed labor unions for inflation.

Education: The American student—and, as a result, the United States—continues to be shortchanged in opportunities to build the necessary academic and vocational background for proper guidance of America's future. This week's most interesting description of laxness in US education comes from David Daiches, former attache at the British Embassy and Professor of English at Cornell, who says:

"Remarkably little serious acquisition of skills and knowledge goes on at the average American high school. The pupils mature sexually earlier than they do in England; and most of the emotional energies of the pupils is taken up with attempts to acquire prestige in the sexual and social battle.

"As a rule, academic distinction brings no prestige whatever. But then there is no such thing as academic distinction in most American high schools."

Many observers feel that this sad situation is directly the fault of "progressive" education, under which a student is allowed to discard subjects which do not "appeal" to him, leaving him unequipped for later life. James T. O'Connell, Undersecretary of Labor, discloses that a survey completed by the California Bureau of Industrial Education reveals that less than 25 per cent of those entering a trade have had proper preparation. Remarks Mr. O'Connell: "Clearly, a need exists to stimulate the interest of youth in the development of productive skills, and this, I feel, can best be accomplished within our local educational systems."

However, because of the efforts of such organizations as the left-wing National Education Association, little progress is being made in this area. High school students are still permitted to choose courses that teach one how to "talk and act intelligently," buy a suit and the fundamentals of child care.

For those interested in the future generation of America, the Council for Basic Education is sponsoring a book, to be published in October by Atlantic-Little, Brown, entitled *The Case for Basic Education: a Program of Aims for Public Schools.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip: A skeleton in Walter P. Reuther's closet is rattling. The Republicans on the Senate Rackets Committee are pressing for investigation of some of the officers and operations of the United Auto Workers—specifically, according to committee member Carl T. Curtis (R.-Neb.), as quoted in the Washington *Star*, Richard T. Gosser, Senior Vice President of the UAW, Peter Zvara (former aide to Gosser) and finally the UAW "Flower Fund." Reuther, in the 1958 hearings, defended Gosser (who is an old friend of the redheaded chief of the union). Reuther also testified that the main purpose of his union's "Flower Fund" was to finance campaigns of incumbent union officials for re-election.

● *Nelson Rockefeller derived little lustre from a poll taken by the Young Women's Republican Club of New York (City) and its male counterpart, the New York Young Republican Club. The groups have about 2,500 members. On a composite basis, the poll shows Rockefeller in the lead with 400 votes to Nixon's 383. This, it is remarked, is a poor showing in Nelson's own bailiwick.*

Broken down on male and female bases, Rockefeller got 301 to Nixon's 240 among the men; but among the women, Nixon came out high man with 143, while Rockefeller got only 99. This offers evidence contrary to the current claim that the attractive New York Governor has a preponderance of the women's vote.

● Senate and House conferees are expected to get together this week to seek agreement on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare appropriations bill, including the Senate amendment introduced by Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) prohibiting the importation of Russian science-teaching equipment unless it is not available from any other source (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 8). Senate conferees are expected to oppose bitterly any House attempt to water down the Bridges amendment. Anti-Communists on Capitol Hill urge their friends across the country to support this amendment by sending approving wires and letters to the Congress.

Waste: A shocking example of wasteful Federal spending is in the making on Capitol Hill. At the close of fiscal 1959 (June 30), the National Institutes of Health had a balance of $5 million from the $294 million voted them by the Congress last year. The explanation for the surplus is a simple one: the NIH had neither a sufficient number of skilled researchers nor the necessary laboratory facilities to absorb wisely the total funds made available by the Congress.

In the Administration's recommended Budget for fiscal 1960, the health institutes would receive approximately the same appropriations as they did in fiscal '59. However, the House voted appropriations totaling some $50 million more than the NIH was able to spend during the recent 12-month period.

If the House action is difficult to comprehend, the follow-up Senate action is inconceivable to most Washington observers. The latter body voted a cool $480 million for the NIH for the fiscal year which began on July 1, even after NIH officials testified that only "$351 million could be effectively expended." Thus, the Senate would give the institutes $186 million more than they spent last year—an amount 37 times as great as their surplus of June 30.

At HUMAN EVENTS press time, House and Senate conferees were trying to reach an agreement on what the final appropriations would be. If any compromise is realized between the monetary proposals of the two bodies, the overriding question will still remain: How can the NIH increase its spending by $50 million plus, without promoting waste and inefficiency?

Prior to the House and Senate votes on the NIH funds, left-wing columnists had a field day in charging conservative Republican and Democratic legislators, who tried to modify the appropriations, with being "in favor" of cancer and heart diseases.

Senator Gordon L. Allott (R.-Colo.), according to Scripps-Howard reporter John Troan, came up with the perfect squelch for these blatant attacks by stating that he is just as worried about dread diseases as anyone else, but that this is no excuse for putting the cart before the horse. Senator Allott said that before authorizing the spending of millions for questionable needs, the US must produce trained researchers who can make the best use of the funds. Otherwise, he predicted, the quality of research will go down.

Foreign Aid: Even "liberal" eyebrows are being raised in Washington at President Sukarno of Indonesia, who last week announced he would dissolve parliament, scrap the constitution and rule by decree.

Despite this bald assumption of dictatorship, the Administration moves ahead with plans to send more foreign aid to Indonesia, which is scheduled to receive in 1960 three times the amount earmarked for Nationalist China (see HUMAN EVENTS for March 25, 1959). Cogent criticism of this continuation was voiced by Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D.-S.C.), who told HUMAN EVENTS: "It just doesn't make sense for the US to fight for freedom and representative government, and then give Sukarno money to destroy these things in his own country."

Sukarno, who last year used his US aid to suppress an anti-Communist, pro-democratic rebellion (which persists, however, as guerilla warfare), is still popular with US "liberals," who have termed his latest maneuver as, at worst, a necessary evil to achieve "guided democracy."

Conservatives in the Capital are wondering what the "liberal" reaction would be if militant anti-Communist Generals Franco and Trujillo were to issue similar statements.

The Security Sieve: The Supreme Court, in a decision that should give much comfort to the network of Soviet spies in the US, recently struck down the Government's industrial security program. The program, before having been dissolved by the Court, had exposed 5,400 definite security risks among some 3,000,000 defense workers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The eight to one decision—noted by columnist Victor Reisel to be a "word-for-word parallel" with the brief filed by the AFL-CIO—came on the appeal of William L. Greene, an aeronautical engineer who had been dismissed from an $18,000-a-year job. The lone dissenter was Justice Tom C. Clark, who said, "Surely one does not have a constitutional right to have access to the Government's military secrets."

Meanwhile, Chairman Francis E. Walter (D.-Pa.) of the House Committee on Un-American Activities introduced a bill to revive the program, regarded by many as vital to this country's internal security. Congressman Walter's bill would give the Secretary of Defense congressional authority to establish the program and thereby "safeguard our industrial establishments without disclosing information injurious to our national security."

Harriman as Mouthpiece: Averell Harriman's highly publicized talk with Nikita Khrushchev served a double purpose for the Red dictator, observers here believe.

Besides attempting to scare the US into appeasement with his tough talk, the Soviet boss was able to use Harriman's prestige as former US ambassador and leading American businessman to build up his regime in the eyes of the Russian people and the peoples of the satellite nations. In a Soviet radio broadcast, Khrushchev said: "The capitalists are now forced to take into account the Soviet Union as a powerful factor of peace throughout the world. [They] are afraid of the growing and strengthening world of socialism which is gaining one victory after another.

"Leaders of the Western world no longer refuse to acknowledge that we shall catch up with them. Now, they would like to console themselves by contending that we shall not catch up with them as soon as planned."

The Russian leader then quoted Harriman as saying he expected Russia to catch up with the US soon.

Such admission on the part of US businessmen, observers point out, works irreparable harm to the morale of dedicated freedom fighters in Russia and its satellites. If the US itself does not expect to maintain its strength in relation to Russia, what hope have they of achieving anything? At the same time, the promise of achieving the long-sought goal may spur Russian workers to greater effort, in the hope that once it is achieved, conditions there will get better.

McCarthy: Alfred Kohlberg, distinguished business leader and well known fighter for anti-Communist causes, writes us about Richard Rovere, author of a new book, *Senator Joe McCarthy* (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 1 and 8):

"Mr. Rovere, former Associate Editor of the *New Masses* magazine and proponent of the Hitler-Stalin pact, claims to have known the late Senator. Just why he hates him so remains unexplained.

"In this book of 271 pages, in which McCarthy is called a liar (without proof) on almost every page, I counted and marked 35 misstatements of fact known to me, plus many more I suspect are inaccurate.

"In an article in *The Reporter* magazine of July 21, 1953, Rovere told how Schine met Cohn and McCarthy. I wrote him at the time and copied his paragraph, inserting in parenthesis corrections of each misstatement of his. As returned to him, his paragraph read:

" 'The story is that last fall a Rabbi Schultz of Yonkers, New York (Rabbi Schultz is of Manhattan), who runs an organization called the Jewish League Against Communism (The American Jewish League Against Communism Inc.) sought out the hospitality of the Gulf Stream Hotel (which he has never seen or been in), another Schine Hotel in Miami Beach (which city Rabbi Schultz has never visited to this day) found *Definition of Communism* (which he has never read and never found in any room) in his room, was stunned by its depth of understanding (via osmosis a la Rovere), promptly sought out the author (possibly while sleepwalking) and introduced him to Roy Cohn (which he has never done).'

"Now in his new book Rovere tells the same story in a new and different version (on page 194) as follows:

" 'It was said to have been a copy found under a room-service menu in a hotel in Coral Gables or some such place that brought Schine and Cohn and McCarthy together. A guest in the hotel read the pamphlet, was struck by its insights, sought out its author, introduced him to George Sokolsky, who introduced him to Roy Cohn, who introduced him to McCarthy, who hired him. At any rate, somehow or other it happened—he was hired.'

"This second version is still far from the facts which are easily verifiable from either Cohn or Schine, both of whom are listed in the Manhattan telephone book. Possibly Rovere feared the truth of this and all the other imaginary incidents in his book would destroy the picture he paints of a McCarthy insincere in his anti-communism."

CLERGYMEN PRAISE HUMAN EVENTS

JOHN P. WEEKS, Pastor, Carthage Methodist Church, Cincinnati, Ohio: "Forty years in the ministry and I've never found a better gold mine of governmental information than in HUMAN EVENTS."

DONALD E. MILLER, Minister, Mulberry Church of Christ, Mulberry, Ohio: "I personally appreciate HUMAN EVENTS and regard it as an excellent source of important information."

REV. H. J. WACKERFUSS, St. James Lutheran Church, Evanston, Ill.: "I do enjoy HUMAN EVENTS immensely. The material is great. . . . "

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) **and** new address (with zone number if any). **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
JOHN R. BENEDICT, *Assistant Editor* NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, *Assistant Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 28 HUMAN EVENTS July 15, 1959

Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

These pages, published by special permission from the Ronald Press, contain extracts from a new book, "Power Unlimited: The Corruption of Union Leadership," by Dr. Sylvester Petro, Professor of Law at the New York University School of Law. Dr. Petro has written it from the transcripts of the McClellan Committee hearings. The author worked in the steel mills after leaving high school, took an active part in organizational drives of the CIO in the 'thirties and learned the hard way about the evils of union power. "Power Unlimited" should be placed in the hands of civic and political leaders, teachers, clergymen and business executives. Give a copy to your public library. You may obtain copies at the retail price of $5 from HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

The Union Boycott

How its Bludgeon Works

By SYLVESTER PETRO

A NUMBER OF BARBERS in New York City had formed a union of their own choosing, the Barbers Guild. But the large, AFL-CIO affiliated Journeymen Barbers felt that the existence of such an independent union, no matter how well it operated and how much it represented the free choice of its members, was intolerable, an insufferable blow to their "prestige."

The [Journeymen] Barbers, accordingly, set up pickets at locations where members of the Guild were employed, including the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The Waldorf picket line at first had little or no effect, according to the testimony before the [McClellan] committee of Robert Verdina, a former official of the Barbers. Patrons and workers of the Waldorf continued to enter and to go peaceably about their business. The barbers working at the Waldorf did not want to change their union affiliation; the Waldorf customers were satisfied with their accommodations; even the other Waldorf workers could apparently see no reason to interrupt their employment.

At this point, the Journeymen Barbers brought to bear a weapon against the Barbers Guild so powerful that it humbled the Waldorf management almost instantly and simply demolished the Guild. A call to Dave Beck, then president of the Teamsters, changed the Barbers' picket line into an instrument of such power. According to Verdina, after the call Teamster truckers refused to deliver food, milk, linens and other items indispensable to the continued operation of the hotel. A few days of this and, according to other testimony, the hotel management indicated that it could not tolerate a shutdown and the consequent unemployment of 2,400 other employees, merely because the 40 barbers insisted upon having their own union.

Faced with the prospect of such destruction at every location where they were employed, the Guild members gave in. They and their 300 Guild brothers employed elsewhere in New York City voted to affiliate with the Journeymen Barbers.

The Guild was destroyed because of the pure power desires of one set of union leaders and the established power of another. The working men were only pawns. The way it came about was by "stranger picketing." This is the device by means of which so much existing union power is made to bring still more. No other method of monopolistic coercion has accounted for as much forced union membership as this one, and none has been as especially privileged. The principles of its operation, since it underlies all the purely economic power of the trade unions, should be clearly understood.

STRANGER PICKETING CAN BRING to bear on a single employer all the power of the unions. On the one hand, the unions have made crossing a picket line one of the worst crimes which a union member can commit, especially when he has been ordered to "respect" it. On the other hand, few businesses can long survive without outside services. Raw materials have to be brought in, and finished products have to be transported to customers.

A single stranger picket is often in a position to do the choking, especially in strongly and per-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vasively unionized areas. But the record shows that there are other economically coercive devices—usually called "secondary boycotts"—available to overcome resisting businessmen in areas where stranger picketing will not do the job by itself.

IN THE LOS ANGELES area, businesses, homeowners and workers were thoroughly regimented by the boycott power of a syndicate composed of owners of dumps, operators of scavenging firms and a union. Captain James E. Hamilton, commander of the intelligence division of the Los Angeles Police Department, was the key committee witness. The police became interested after receiving several complaints from homeowners concerning the poor service which they were receiving from the scavenging firms, and the substantial increases in the cost. He found that no matter how dissatisfied the customer might be, there was no possibility of changing to a new collection agency. Investigation revealed that a plan for parceling out exclusive territories in which no competition might enter was enforced by the union controlling the workers in the scavenging firms and the dumps. As Captain Hamilton put it:

> . . . If an independent [employer] went into an area to try and solicit accounts, he was cut off at the dump by a union business agent. So, in effect, it appeared that the business agent was the enforcer for the association. . . . The dumps are . . . under contract with the same local that the drivers belonged to. So that the contract . . . is such that only union drivers should dump there.

The only difference between this power play and the many others continuously taking place is that the garbage-collection cartel came more immediately and more vividly to the attention of the public, so that people got for once an immediate taste of the diet which unions have been forcing down the throats of businessmen for a generation. That its fundamental principle of operation was the same is revealed by the way the union made it impossible for a new competitor to enter the field. Captain Hamilton tells of an army veteran who tried:

> . . . one ex-GI from World War II said he thought it was a good business to get into, and he got himself a truck and fixed up a bunch of barrels and he started soliciting in a new residential tract where there was no pickup service. He had built his route up to about 1,500 customers, all primarily home pickups, when he was stopped at the dump one day and told by the checker at the dump that he would have to see [Frank J.] Matula, [secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Local 396].

The details of the ensuing runaround are too lengthy for reproduction here. Chief Counsel Robert Kennedy's summary will, however, suffice:

> This was an example of an individual that tried to get into the union who was told by the head of the union . . . to see the association. The head of the association told him that he could only come into the association if he gave up two-thirds of his business. He refused to do that. He went back to the union and the union would not allow him to come in.

The [Senate Rackets] committee's record on boycotts leaves little room for doubt that the affiliated unions, out to control the entire labor force, will do whatever seems necessary to achieve that end. Having near-monopoly power already, they are in a position to apply bone-cracking pressures against any employer whose employees resist unionization or who happen to belong to another union. They reject the principle of free employee choice, for they feel that employees belong to them, and that anybody who stands in their way must be demolished.

The unions daily engage in price-raising, monopolistic and predatory practices. If it is necessary to trample upon individual rights and to transform the free enterprise economy into their own cartelized image in order to gain their ends, they will do so—so long as society permits them the special privilege of monopolistic coercion.

Horace A. Crouch had a gun behind the door when two investigators from the McClellan Committee called at his home in Portland, Oregon. It took a certain amount of probing by Chief Counsel Kennedy later, during the hearings, to find out what Crouch feared. After interrogation, it turned out that he had crossed up the Teamsters and, as he put it, "sometimes in Portland the Teamsters get pretty rough." His offense against the Teamsters was that he had testified before an Oregon grand jury, presumably about the consequences of a business mistake he had made.

Frank Malloy, a Teamster agent, allegedly told Crouch that his Mount Hood Cafe would be picketed unless he took out pinball machines supplied by one Stan Terry and replaced them with Acme machines, of which the Teamsters approved. Thus, Crouch's education in Teamster tactics began. He had a great deal to learn.

One of the first things he learned was that Terry had tried to get Teamster approval of his machines, but had failed. "I asked Stan Terry," said Crouch, " 'Why don't you join the union?' And he said, 'They won't let me in.' " The second thing he learned was that Malloy was serious in threatening to picket, despite the fact that the restaurant had already been organized by another union. And the third thing he learned was that he could not stay in business while his restaurant was picketed by the Teamsters. His description is short but definitive: "I couldn't get coffee, I couldn't get bread, I couldn't get meat deliveries."

AFTER FOUR DAYS of picketing had brought his business to a standstill, Crouch removed the offending Terry machines. Not only could he get no deliveries of supplies; he could not even get any customers to enter the restaurant. As it happened, he never did install the Acme machines. He waited for three months, till his original supplier finally got clearance from the Teamsters, and then he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put back the Terry machines. Malloy took the Fifth Amendment when questioned about the Crouch affair.

Four unions (the Bakery & Confectionery Workers, the Meat Cutters & Butchers, the Restaurant Union, and the Teamsters) undertook "organizational" picketing of the Philadelphia premises of Horn & Hardart in 1955-56. Leonard W. Lowther, executive vice president, told the McClellan committee that "we had never been approached by any of the unions as to the signing of a contract or any communication whatsoever." But suddenly, on May 2, 1955, "a complete picket line was thrown around our plant which, of course, stopped all deliveries." Of 4,800 Horn and Hardart employees in Philadelphia, less than 100 joined the picket line.

Another firm found itself in trouble because it tried to continue to supply Horn & Hardart during the siege. Solomon Freedman, a senior partner of McCray & Hunter, felt that Horn & Hardart was an innocent victim, a fair concern which would have respected its employees' rights. "I felt," he said, "that I was going to continue on to help them as much as I possibly could." His scruples cost him a great deal as he testified:

> We suffered approximately $15,000 or $20,000 worth of damage. . . . They threw gasoline on our merchandise. They threw stink bombs in our stores.

A big truck seemed to be the union's main target. Freedman explained to the committee:

> There are different incidents at various times on this very same truck. . . . Since we found it almost impossible to operate under our own name, we took the name off the truck, and we assigned it to one of our employees, and he ran the truck.
>
> We parked it at a different location every night. We finally resorted to parking it back of the police squad, thinking that there they wouldn't molest it. But they towed it away from that location several times. The last time they towed it away, that was the end of it. . . . They dumped it in the river.

There are heroes, as well as thugs, in these affairs. Solomon Freedman was a hero, and so was William S. Young, his only driver. Said Freedman of Young:

> He thought as I did, that right prevails over anything else. He knew it was a righteous cause, and that is the reason he went along, in spite of the fact his life was in danger numerous times. He still continued on, and just wouldn't let down. Without him . . . we could have never effected our deliveries.

ONE THING that can be said for Emil Mazey is that, unlike a good many other UAW officials, he speaks his mind plainly, at times. During the Kohler strike, he said: "No one has a right to scab despite the law."

Mazey also thinks that pickets have a right to prevent nonstrikers from going to work. That thought is but a logical extension of what he expressed in one of the Kohler strike bulletins:

"The people who have returned to work are traitors to our cause. They have joined the ranks of the enemy, and they ought to be treated as such."

Senator Karl Mundt (of the McClellan Committee) wanted to be sure that Mazey meant what he said:

> Now let us take one of these men. He has a job, and a family, and a career of experience working in the plant. If he goes to work or if he went to work during that strike, do you consider him a traitor?
>
> Mazey: Yes.

When asked the basis of his feeling, Mazey replied:

> The purpose of the strike is to improve the wages and working conditions for all of the workers in the plant, whether they are members of the union or not. Anyone who aids the company, who makes it more difficult to achieve economic and social justice at the bargaining table, are betraying the cause of all of those workers, and therefore they are traitors.

According to Mazey, if a majority of employees vote to strike, it is exactly the same as when Congress votes to go to war. On one occasion when he made such a comparison, Chairman McClellan caught him up:

> We are not talking about war. We are talking about the right of an individual to make a decision to follow a livelihood for himself or his family.

When Mazey said, "There is a great deal of similarity, Senator," the Chairman responded:

> I do not think so. I think a man who has a job, who wants to go to work, should have the right. I think you should have the right to strike and you should have a right to put those pickets out there . . . but you do not have any right to mass them in front of that gate where a man who wants to work cannot get in.

Mazey went on to say that the law ought to prohibit the operation of a plant during a strike. When pushed, however, he receded a bit, saying that "perhaps" he would be willing to go along with a law which prohibited only the hiring of new employees during a strike.

THE MCCLELLAN COMMITTEE was told on February 26, 1957—the first day of its hearings—all it needed to know about the basic causes of serfdom in trade unions. Wallace Turner, a reporter for the *Portland Oregonian*, testified as follows:

> Mr. Turner: I mean the members of the union are scared to death to reveal what they know.
>
> The Chairman: They are afraid to tell the truth and to reveal what they know?
>
> Mr. Turner: Yes, sir.
>
> The Chairman: Their fear is what?
>
> Mr. Turner: That their union cards, at least, will be taken up and they will be out of employment.
>
> The Chairman: You are testifying under oath that that is what they have revealed to you in the course of your investigation . . . ?
>
> Mr. Turner: I have been so told by members of that union.
>
> Senator Mundt: You are saying under oath that the men who come to visit you at night are afraid not only of the fact they would lose their jobs and their means of livelihood, but that they might also be subjected to physical violence?
>
> Mr. Turner: Yes, sir.

Most of Part 29 and all of Part 30 of the Mc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Clellan Committee's transcripts deal with the activities of Max Block, head of Locals 342 and 640 of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen's Union in the New York City metropolitan area. According to the testimony, he lived very well; he also accepted an extremely generous dues-financed pension for himself, had a great number of employers eating out of his hand, and strictly controlled the employment of his members. It would not do any member much good to complain, if he felt like complaining, about Block's conduct. Daniel Beatson, a former business agent in Block's locals, described the unions' control of employment in the wholesale meat industry:

> [Locals 342 and 640] control practically 100 per cent of the wholesale meat industry in New York City. Practically all the meat from all over, for that area, comes into the 14th Street Market, the Westchester Market, or the Ford Green Market, and then [is] disbursed to the supermarkets and retail markets in a 100-mile area.
>
> Mr. Kennedy: You say that is the control that it has over the business, [but] what about the individual employees? Is that an important organization as far as an individual getting a job?
>
> Mr. Beatson: Yes, because the hiring, with the exception of Swift's and Armour's, . . . is done exclusively at the union hall.
>
> Mr. Kennedy: It is a union-hall operation?
>
> Mr. Beatson: That is right.
>
> Mr. Kennedy: You have to go to the union in order to get a job?
>
> Mr. Beatson: That is right.
>
> Mr. Kennedy: Can you transfer from one job to another?
>
> Mr. Beatson: Not without the approval of the union.

THE "HOT-CARGO" contract is another carefully tooled machine of oppression for which the Teamsters have managed to secure a privilege from the National Labor Relations Board, although the Congress [apparently, at the time of this writing] intends to outlaw it.

This point is vividly documented by the testimony of the former owner of Coffey's Transfer Company in Omaha, Nebraska. The unavailability to him of immediate injunctive relief against a vicious Teamster boycott resulted in the destruction of his business.

Tom Coffey had a form contract thrown at him by Teamsters agents who indicated that they were not going to be bothered with trying to organize the employees. He described the situation to the committee:

> They were going to [organize the men] from the top down and they didn't have time to fool with the little companies such as mine and I suggested then that we ask the NLRB for an election. They said they weren't interested in an election and I said that I would insist on an election.
>
> They informed me that if I did, that they would stall any election that I might insist on until I was bankrupt, anyhow.

The Teamsters instituted a strangling boycott, supplemented with liberal use of violence; delayed the election; broke a promise to the NLRB to desist from the boycott while the endless election complexities dragged on; and, although Coffey ultimately came out on top legally in every way, he was still forced out of business. Coffey put it succinctly:

> **"I never lost a case before a Federal Court or before the NLRB, but I lost my business."**

The committee was of the opinion that the NLRB's dilatory election processes were fundamentally responsible for Coffey's sad experience. NLRB Chairman Boyd Leedom was therefore summoned to give testimony on that issue. Briefly summarized, Leedom's testimony was that the board's election procedures, like all legal procedures, can always be abused by parties intent upon delaying decisions. In exigent cases this delay may hurt the injured party irreparably; the requirement of due process will not permit the waiving of otherwise valid rules. Leedom explained:

> It looks like red tape to a union or an employer which feels frustrated by the delays, but what is one man's red tape is sometimes the other man's due process.

Leedom could think of no way to help the McClellan Committee in its solicitude for small businessmen who are destroyed by vicious union conduct occurring in the interim of legal proceedings. He thought that there were "no glaring defects in our own procedures."

The McClellan findings demonstrate that governments at all levels have failed to apply the law of the land faithfully and vigorously to abusive union conduct, conduct which would not be permitted to other persons or organizations.

Unions have taken great advantage of this special privilege to defy the laws, precepts and principles of good society.

Working men have been beaten and robbed. Businessmen have been the victims of extortion.

Consumers have been exploited.

Political figures and governmental officers and agencies have been corrupted.

Few significant areas of society have been left uncontaminated. Out of unlimited power, unlimited corruption is breeding.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE UNION BOYCOTT" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED